



## CORRESPONDENCE

# The prion dilemma confounding science educators [v1; ref status: indexed, <http://f1000r.es/ku>]

Igor V Zaitsev<sup>1</sup>, Ling Chen<sup>1</sup>, Susie Boydston-White<sup>1</sup>, Manita Pavel<sup>1</sup>, Svetlana N Shugaeva<sup>2</sup>, Alla G Petrova<sup>3</sup>, Oksana V Williams<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Borough of Manhattan Community College, The City University of New York, New York, 10007-1097, USA

<sup>2</sup>Irkutsk State Medical Academy of Postgraduate Education, Irkutsk, 664003, Russian Federation

<sup>3</sup>Irkutsk Medical University, Irkutsk, 664003, Russian Federation

<sup>4</sup>American International School of Bucharest, Bucharest, 077190, Romania

**v1** **First Published:** 09 Jan 2013, 2:4 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-4.v1)  
**Latest Published:** 09 Jan 2013, 2:4 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-4.v1)

## Abstract

In this paper, the issue of the prion hypothesis, a simmering controversy within the scientific community, is addressed. We inquire into the appropriateness of the use of certain augmentations and rhetoric approaches used during scientific debates, as well as the aptness of unequivocal statements in textbooks that indicate “abnormal prions” as a primary cause of Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies.

## Article Status Summary

### Referee Responses

Referees	1	2	3
<b>v1</b> published 09 Jan 2013	 report	 report	 report

- 1 Jose Valpuesta**, Centro Nacional de Biotecnología, Campus Universidad Autónoma de Madrid Spain
- 2 Kai Zinn**, California Institute of Technology USA
- 3 Hidehiro Mizusawa**, Tokyo Medical and Dental University Japan

### Latest Comments

**Vitaly Citovsky**, Department of Biochemistry and Cell Biology, State University of New York at Stony Brook, USA  
 09 Jan 2013 (V1)

**Associated Short Research Article**

**Karapetyan YE** » Long double stranded RNA is present in scrapie infected cells and tissues, *F1000Research* 2012, 1:52 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.1-52.v1)

**Corresponding author:** Igor V Zaitsev (izaitsev@bmcc.cuny.edu)

**How to cite this article:** Zaitsev IV, Chen L, Boydston-White S *et al.* (2013) The prion dilemma confounding science educators [v1; ref status: indexed, <http://f1000r.es/ku>] *F1000Research* 2013, 2:4 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-4.v1)

**Copyright:** © 2013 Zaitsev IV et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution Licence](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Grant information:** The author(s) declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

**First Published:** 09 Jan 2013, 2:4 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-4.v1)

**First Indexed:** 09 Sep 2013, 2:4 (doi: 10.12688/f1000research.2-4.v1)

## Correspondence

According to some in the field, one should refrain from discussions concerning controversial issues in science if one is not actively conducting experimental research<sup>1</sup>. We must dissent, most particularly when the prions controversy is under consideration. One does not have to conduct scientific experiments to recognize not only the flaws of the prion protein (PrP) hypothesis<sup>2</sup>, but the inappropriate vocabulary used during discussions of the issue. As science educators, we are still confounded when trying to present the cause of Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathy (TSE) to our students.

To start with, for the past twenty years, the majority of biology text books unequivocally identified PrP<sup>Sc</sup> as the causative agent of TSE, and some texts even refer to the “prion hypothesis” as the “prion theory”, please see [Table 1](#). Yet, when introducing the scientific method in high schools and college classes, we establish that in order for a hypothesis to become a scientific theory, it has to be supported many times over through experimentation<sup>3</sup> providing a substantial and conclusive body of evidence<sup>4</sup>. Upon reviewing experimental work on PrP, one notes that initial studies are rarely, if ever,

repeated by other scientists. Instead, they move on without giving reconsideration to the assumption upon which they base their work<sup>5</sup>.

When describing the scientific method, it is important that we emphasize the difference between faith and fact. Nevertheless, during discussions of the PrP hypothesis in meetings, conferences and private discussions of scientists, “I think” is too often replaced by “I believe”. Perhaps, this inclination began when the Karolinka neurologist Lars Edison told *The Times* newspaper, upon the announcement of the Prusiner’s Noble Prize: “There are still people who don’t believe that a protein can cause these diseases, but we believe it”<sup>6</sup>. There should be no place in science for such a subjective declaration. Even recent publications emphasize that the scientific community has been split into PrP “believers” and “nonbelievers”. Laura Manuelidis, one of the main scientists who rejects the PrP hypothesis, has been portrayed as a “prion heretic”<sup>7</sup>. Upon entering the combination of “prions” and “belief” in a Google search, we generated an astonishing 918,000 hits. Another recent tendency in modern science is marginalizing scientists as the “minority” versus the “majority”, as is seen in the PrP controversy<sup>7</sup>, a partition more suitable for political rather than scientific discussions.

**Table 1. The indisputable textbook statements concerning infectious agent of Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies.**

Authors	Name of the textbook	Publishing company	Year of the publication	Statements
McKee T., McKee J.R.	Biochemistry: The molecular Basis of Life	McCraw Hill	2003	“Prion disease are caused when the conformation of PrP <sup>C</sup> is converted to PrP <sup>Sc</sup> ”.
Gladwin M., Trattler W.	Clinical Microbiology Made Ridiculously Simple	MedMaster	2004	“The prion-only hypothesis is the most widely accepted theory today”.
Freeman S.	Biological Science	Pearson Benjamin Cummins	2008	“Over the past several decades, evidence has accumulated that certain proteins can act as infectious, disease causing agents”.
Russell P.J., Wolfe S.L., Hertz P.E., Starr C., McMillan B.	Biology: the Dynamic Science	Thomson Brooks/Cole	2008	“Prions ... are the only known infectious agents that do not include a nucleic acid molecule”. “Prions have been identified as the causal agents of certain diseases that degenerate the nervous system in mammals”.
Campbell M.K., Farrell S.O.	Biochemistry	Thomson Brooks/Cole	2009	“It has been established that the causative agent of mad-cow disease, as well as the related diseases scrapie in sheep, chronic wasting (CWD) in deer and elk, and human spongiform encephalopathy in humans is a small (28-kDa) protein called a prion”.
Tymoczko J.L., Berg J.M., Lubert S.	Biochemistry: A Short Course	W.H. Freeman & Company	2010	“Certain infectious neurological diseases were found to be transmitted by agents that were similar in size to viruses but consisted only of protein”.
Talaro K.P.	Foundations in Microbiology	McGraw Hill	2009	“Prions are incredibly hardy “pathogens”. They are known to cause diseases called transmissible spongiform encephalopathies”.
Cowan M.K., Bunn J.	Microbiology Fundamentals: A Clinical Approach	McGraw Hill	2013	“The transmissible agent in CDJ is a prion”.
Tortora G.J., Funke B.R., Case C.L.	Microbiology: An Introduction	Pearson	2013	“Several fatal diseases affecting the human central nervous system are caused by prions”.

In covering the PrP hypothesis in classrooms, are we also to employ a vocabulary in which the scientific community is divided into “believers” and “nonbelievers” or “majority” and “minority” as if we were referring to a religious conviction or a political debate rather than a scientific dilemma?

---

### Author contributions

IVZ was involved in reviewing the literature and writing the letter. LC, SB-W, MP, SNS, AGP and OVW equally contributed to

the emerged discussion and conceptualization of the paper and all approved the final version of the manuscript.

### Competing interests

No competing interests were disclosed.

### Grant information

The author(s) declared that no grants were involved in supporting this work.

---

## References

1. AAAS: **Live Chat: When you're in the Scientific Minority**. *Science*. 2011.  
[Reference Source](#)
2. Zaitsev IV: **Prions: Introducing a Complex Scientific Controversy to a Biology Classroom**. *Am Biol Teach*. 2009; **71**(9): 525–530.  
[Publisher Full Text](#)
3. Campbell NA, Reece JB: **Biology**. Pearson Educational, Inc. as Benjamin Cummings, San Francisco 2005.  
[Reference Source](#)
4. Medley D: **Biology: Reviewing the Essentials**. AMSCO School Publications, Inc., New York 1998.  
[Reference Source](#)
5. Zaitsev IV: **Could Prion Protein Assumptions Engender Misleading Sensational Conclusions?** 2010.  
[Reference Source](#)
6. Rhodes R: **Deadly Feasts**. Simon & Schuster 1997.  
[Reference Source](#)
7. Couzin-Frankel J: **The prion heretic**. *Science*. 2011; **332**(6033): 1024–1027.  
[Publisher Full Text](#)

## Current Referee Status:

---

### Referee Responses for Version 1



**Hidehiro Mizusawa**

Department of Neurology and Neurological Science, Tokyo Medical and Dental University, Tokyo, Japan

**Approved: 09 September 2013**

**Referee Report:** 09 September 2013

I agree with the authors on how important open discussion is in science. However, the prion hypothesis has been well and openly discussed for many years. Due to the hypothesis, many achievements have been obtained. Abnormal prion proteins resulting from prion protein gene mutations clearly cause genetic prion diseases.

Minor point: "Abnormal prions" should be "prions", because prions all are abnormal.

**I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.**

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.



**Kai Zinn**

Division of Biology, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA, USA

**Approved with reservations: 25 January 2013**

**Referee Report:** 25 January 2013

The scientific community has been split in the past into those who believed the prion hypothesis and those who did not. During the 1980s and part of the 1990s, most work on the prion hypothesis was from **Stanley Prusiner's** group, and those who questioned the prion hypothesis were doing so largely by finding potential errors in the work of one laboratory. However, now we have hundreds of papers on mammalian PrP, including, most importantly, the demonstration that transmissible disease can be caused by a pure recombinant prion protein (**Wang et al, (2010)**), that are not from Prusiner and whose results are consistent with the prion hypothesis. In addition, work by many groups on yeast prions demonstrated the validity of the generalized prion hypothesis (inheritance mediated by conformational changes in proteins) in a more experimentally tractable system in which controls that were not possible for mammalian PrP could easily be done. So, at this point, I see no problems with the statements made in the textbooks that are listed in the Table. The prion hypothesis is as well-established, at least for mammalian PrP, as the chemiosmotic (Mitchell) hypothesis for ATP synthesis by mitochondria, which was controversial at the time it was proposed in the early 60s, but which is now the only mechanism described in textbooks. It is no longer necessary to even mention the alternative ideas from the 60s, such as chemical coupling.

**I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.**

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.



**Jose Valpuesta**

Centro Nacional de Biotecnología, Campus Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid, Spain

**Approved: 17 January 2013**

**Referee Report:** 17 January 2013

I agree with what I think is the main message of the authors, that the scientific debate should be open and should rest in facts and not in beliefs. The first point is very important and the same 'prion hypothesis' is a good example of this, as it was under attack for a long time until substantial evidence was produced in its favour. I agree with the authors in that in science one should refrain from using statements ('I believe ...') more adequate for religious or political debates, but when dealing with educational matters, simple statements need be used to convey a certain message or information. Time will tell whether these messages are correct, and the text books and scientific journals are full of information that later has been proven to be wrong, but which has been useful to stir the scientific debate.

**I have read this submission. I believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard.**

**Competing Interests:** No competing interests were disclosed.

---

## Article Comments

### Comments for Version 1

**Vitaly Citovsky**, Department of Biochemistry and Cell Biology, State University of New York at Stony Brook, USA

Posted: 09 Jan 2013

I am not a prion researcher, but this Correspondence is not really on prions but on dogmas and professional politics in science. Overall, I agree with the authors that teaching and, importantly, discussing/reviewing science (e.g., in review articles or when reviewing papers or grant proposals) should be based on facts and not on "beliefs" or political correctness. This seemingly obvious notion, however, is not trivial as it is not always followed by scientists as well as by laypeople.

-----  
Vitaly Citovsky  
Department of Biochemistry and Cell Biology  
State University of New York

Stony Brook, NY 11794-5215

Tel.: 631.632.9534

Fax: 631.632.8575

E-mail: [vitaly.citovsky@stonybrook.edu](mailto:vitaly.citovsky@stonybrook.edu)

***Competing Interests:*** no competing interests

---